



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/884,296	06/19/2001	Steven B. Adler	AUS920010620US1	3926

87220 7590 05/12/2009  
Walder Intellectual Property Law (END)  
C/O Walder Intellectual Property Law, P.C.  
17330 Preston Road  
Suite 100B  
Dallas, TX 75252

EXAMINER
----------

ZELASKIEWICZ, CHRYSTINA E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/12/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/884,296	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ADLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> CHRYSTINA ZELASKIEWICZ	<b>Art Unit</b> 3621	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) CHRYSTINA ZELASKIEWICZ. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) STEVE WALDER. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 29 April 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Coffey and Ginter.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussed re-writing proposed claim amendments as positive limitations to overcome intended use language under Ex Parte Miyazaki; showing support in the specification for "transforming data..." and "identifying privacy-related risks..."; Examiner indicated re-written positive limitations may overcome prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Christina Zelaskiewicz/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3621